

Norman C. Kleinberg
 Theodore V. H. Mayer
 William J. Beausoleil
 HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP
 One Battery Park Plaza
 New York, New York 10004-1482
 (212) 837-6000

Attorneys for Defendant Merck & Co., Inc.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X		
IN RE:	:	
Fosamax Products Liability Litigation	:	1:06-md-1789 (JFK)
	:	
-----X		
<i>This Document Relates to:</i>	:	ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE
Gloria Jean Holderfield and	:	DEFENSES OF MERCK
David Holderfield	:	& CO., INC.;
v. Merck & Co., Inc.	:	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
	:	
Case No: 1:08-cv-04150-JFK	:	
-----X		

Defendant, Merck & Co., Inc. (“Merck”), by its undersigned attorneys, hereby answers the Complaint. Merck denies all allegations set forth in the Complaint, except to the extent such allegations are specifically admitted below:

Merck denies each and every allegation of the Introductory Paragraph, except that Merck admits that its principal place of business is located at One Merck Drive, P.O. Box 100, Whitehouse Station, New Jersey 08889-0100 and Merck states that it is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the residence of Plaintiffs.

GENERAL BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW OF CLAIMS

1. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 1, except that Merck admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a civil action for damages, but denies that there is any factual or legal basis for same.

2. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 2, except that it admits that Merck manufactured, marketed, and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information. Merck denies any allegations in Paragraph 2 inconsistent with that prescribing information and respectfully refers the Court to the Physicians' Desk Reference ("PDR") for FOSAMAX® for its actual language and full text.

3. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 3.

4. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 4.

5. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 5.

6. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 6.

7. Merck is without knowledge as to whether Plaintiff used FOSAMAX®.

Merck denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 7.

8. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 8.

9. Merck is without knowledge as to whether Plaintiff was prescribed and ingested FOSAMAX®. Merck denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 9.

10. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 10, except that Merck admits that Plaintiffs purport to bring a civil action for damages, but denies that there is any factual or legal basis for same.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. The allegations of the first sentence of Paragraph 11 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is required, Merck denies each and every allegation of the first sentence of Paragraph 11. As to the allegations of the second sentence of Paragraph 11, Merck is without knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to these allegations, except that Merck admits that it is a corporation organized under the laws of the State of New Jersey with its principal place of business in New Jersey. Merck is without knowledge as to the allegations in the third sentence of Paragraph 11, but for jurisdictional purposes only, admits that the Plaintiffs seek in excess of \$75,000.

12. The allegations of Paragraph 12 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent a response is required, Merck denies the allegations of Paragraph 12, except that Merck admits that pursuant to Section 4 of Case Management Order No. 3 entered by Judge John F. Keenan on November 1, 2006, this action may be filed directly in the Southern District of New York. Merck reserves all rights under Section 4 of Case Management Order No. 3 and respectfully refers the Court to the relevant Case Management Order.

PARTIES

13. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 13.

14. Merck admits the allegations of Paragraph 14.

15. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 15, except that it admits that Merck manufactured, marketed, and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information.

16. Merck admits that it is registered to do business in the State of New York.

17. Merck is without knowledge as to what is meant by the phrase “regularly solicits and transacts business,” so the allegations in Paragraph 17 are denied.

18. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 18, except that it admits that Merck manufactured, marketed, and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information. Merck denies any allegations in Paragraph 18 inconsistent with that prescribing information and respectfully refers the Court to the PDR for FOSAMAX® for its actual language and full text.

19. Merck is without knowledge as to what is meant by the phrase “substantial revenue,” so the allegations in Paragraph 19 are denied.

20. Merck is without knowledge as to what is meant by “consequences,” so the allegations in Paragraph 20 are denied.

SUBSTANTIVE ALLEGATIONS

21. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 21, except that Merck admits that it sought and, in 1995, first obtained FDA approval to manufacture and market FOSAMAX® 10 mg and FOSAMAX® 40 mg tablets, a prescription medication approved by the FDA for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information. Merck denies any allegations in Paragraph 21 inconsistent with that prescribing information.

22. Merck admits only that FOSAMAX® is a prescription medication approved by the FDA for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information and denies any allegations in Paragraph 22 inconsistent with that prescribing

information. Merck respectfully refers the Court to the PDR for FOSAMAX® for its actual language and full text. Merck also refers the Court to the prescribing information for Aredia and Zometa, and denies any allegations in Paragraph 22 with respect to Aredia and Zometa inconsistent with that prescribing information.

23. Merck admits only that some bisphosphonates contain nitrogen and some do not and that FOSAMAX® is a prescription medication approved by the FDA for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information. Merck denies any allegations in Paragraph 23 inconsistent with that prescribing information. Merck respectfully refers the Court to the PDR for FOSAMAX® for its actual language and full text. Merck also refers the Court to the prescribing information for Aredia, Bondronat, Didronel, Bonefos, Loron, and Skelid, and denies any allegations in Paragraph 23 with respect to Aredia, Bondronat, Didronel, Bonefos, Loron, and Skelid inconsistent with that prescribing information. Merck denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 23.

24. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 24.

25. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 25.

26. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 26.

27. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 27.

28. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 28.

29. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 29.

30. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 30.

31. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 31.

32. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 32.

33. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 33, except that Merck admits that Fosamax product sales in 2005 amounted to approximately \$3.19 billion.

Plaintiff's Use of Fosamax

34. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 34.

35. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 35.

36. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 36.

37. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 37.

38. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 38.

39. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 39.

**EQUITABLE TOLLING OF APPLICABLE
STATUTES OF LIMITATIONS**

40. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 40.

41. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 41.

42. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 42.

43. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 43.

**COUNT I
Negligence**

44. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 43, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

45. The allegations in Paragraph 45 are conclusions of law to which no response is required; to the extent that a response is deemed necessary, the allegations are denied and Merck respectfully refers the Court to the relevant legal standard, including any conflict of law rules.

46. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 46.

47. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 47, including each and every allegation contained in subparagraphs (a) through (c).

48. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 48.

49. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 49.

50. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 50.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT II
Negligence Per Se

51. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 50, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

52. Merck admits the allegation in Paragraph 52.

53. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 53.

54. The allegations in Paragraph 54 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed necessary, Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 54.

55. The allegations in Paragraph 55 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed necessary, Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 55.

55. [Note: This is the second paragraph numbered 55.] Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 55.

56. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 56.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT III
Strict Liability – Failure to Warn

57. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 56, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

58. Merck denies each and every allegation of the first sentence of Paragraph 58, except that it admits that Merck manufactured, marketed and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information. The allegations in the second sentence of Paragraph 58 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed necessary, the allegations are denied and Merck respectfully refers the Court to the relevant legal standard, including any conflict of law rules.

59. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 59.

60. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 60.

61. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 61.

62. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 62.

63. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 63.

64. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 64.

65. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 65.

66. The allegations in the first sentence of Paragraph 66 are conclusions of law to which no response is required. To the extent that a response is deemed necessary, the allegations are denied and Merck respectfully refers the Court to the relevant legal standard, including any conflict of law rules. Merck denies each and every allegation of the second sentence of Paragraph 66.

67. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 67.

68. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 68.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT IV
Strict Liability – Defective Design

69. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 68, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

70. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 70, except that it admits that Merck manufactured, marketed and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information.

71. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 71, except that it admits that Merck manufactured, marketed and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information and states that it is without knowledge as to the condition of the FOSAMAX® Plaintiff alleges she consumed.

72. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 72.

73. Merck is without knowledge as to whether Plaintiff used FOSAMAX®.

Merck denies the remaining allegations of Paragraph 73.

74. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 74.

75. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 75.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT V
Breach of Express Warranty

76. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 75, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

77. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 77, and respectfully refers the Court to the FDA-approved prescribing information for any and all representations contained therein. Merck further avers that FOSAMAX® is a prescription medication approved by the FDA for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information.

78. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 78.

79. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 79.

80. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 80.

81. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 81.

82. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 82.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT VI
Breach of Implied Warranty

83. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 82, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

84. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 84, except that Merck admits that it manufactured, marketed, and distributed the prescription medicine FOSAMAX® for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information.

85. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 85, and respectfully refers the Court to the FDA-approved prescribing information for any and all representations contained therein. Merck further avers that FOSAMAX® is a prescription medication approved by the FDA for prescription in accordance with its approved prescribing information.

86. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 86.

87. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 87.

88. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 88.

89. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 89.

89. [Note: This is the second paragraph numbered 89.] Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 89.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT VII
Common Law Fraud

91. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 89, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

92. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 92.

93. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 93.

94. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 94.

95. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 95.

96. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 96.

97. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 97.

98. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 98.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT VIII
Punitive Damages

99. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 98, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

100. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 100.

101. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 101.

102. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 102.

103. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 103.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT IV
[Note: This is the second claim labeled as "Count IV."]
Violation of G.B.L. § 349

104. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 103, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

105. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 105.

106. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 106.

107. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 107.

108. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 108.

109. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 109.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

COUNT X
Loss of Consortium

110. Merck repleads its answers to Paragraphs 1 through and including 109, and by this reference hereby incorporates the same herein in this paragraph, and makes the same a part hereof as though fully set forth *verbatim*.

111. Merck lacks knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to the truth or falsity of the allegations of Paragraph 111.

112. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 112.

113. Merck denies each and every allegation of Paragraph 113.

114. Merck admits that Plaintiffs are seeking damages in Paragraph 114, but denies that there is any legal or factual basis for same.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

Merck denies that Plaintiffs are entitled to any of the relief requested in their Prayer for Relief.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES

Discovery and investigation may reveal that any one or more of the following affirmative defenses should be available to Merck in this matter. Merck, therefore, asserts said affirmative defenses in order to preserve the right to assert them. Upon

completion of discovery, and if the facts warrant, Merck may withdraw any of these affirmative defenses as it may deem appropriate. Further, Merck reserves the right to amend its Answer to assert additional defenses, cross-claims, counterclaims, and other claims and defenses as discovery proceeds. Merck demands strict proof of all claims and allegations contained in Plaintiffs' Complaint that Merck has not expressly admitted. Further answering and by way of additional defense, Merck states as follows:

FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Each and every claim asserted or raised in the Complaint is barred by the applicable statute of limitations, doctrine of prescription, and/or is otherwise untimely.

SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The Complaint fails to state a claim upon which relief can be granted.

THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Each and every claim asserted or raised in the Complaint is barred by the doctrines of estoppel, waiver or statutory and regulatory compliance.

FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon information and belief, such injuries or losses were caused in whole or in part through the operation of nature or other intervening cause or causes.

FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs assert claims based on Merck's adherence to and compliance with applicable state laws, regulations and rules, such claims are preempted by federal law under the Supremacy Clause of the United States Constitution.

SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs assert claims based upon an alleged failure by Merck to warn Plaintiffs directly of alleged dangers associated with the use of FOSAMAX®, such claims are barred under the learned intermediary doctrine because Merck has discharged its duty to warn in its warnings to the prescribing physician.

SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Other persons or entities who are not parties to this suit were guilty of negligence which was the sole proximate cause of, or a contributing cause to, the damages alleged in the Complaint. Merck anticipates more specific information regarding the identity and potential liability of these non-parties will be developed during discovery. Accordingly, any damages awarded should be apportioned.

EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The injuries and damages, if any, sustained by the Plaintiffs resulted in whole or in part from their own comparative negligence and any damages recovered should be reduced accordingly.

NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, such injuries or losses were only sustained after Plaintiffs knowingly, voluntarily, and willfully assumed the risk of any injury as the result of the consumption of, administration of, or exposure to any medicine or pharmaceutical preparation manufactured or distributed by Merck or another manufacturer.

TENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon information and belief, such injuries and losses were caused by the actions of persons not having real or apparent authority to take said actions on behalf of Merck and over whom Merck had no control and for whom Merck may not be held accountable.

ELEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, upon information and belief, such injuries and losses were proximately caused by Plaintiffs' misuse or abuse of FOSAMAX®.

TWELFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

If Plaintiffs have sustained injuries or losses as alleged in the Complaint, such injuries or losses resulted from Plaintiffs' pre-existing and/or unrelated medical, genetic and/or environmental conditions, diseases, or illnesses, idiosyncratic reactions, subsequent medical conditions or natural courses of conditions for which this Defendant is not responsible.

THIRTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims for breach of warranty are also barred for lack of timely notice of breach and/or lack of privity.

FOURTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part under the applicable state law because FOSAMAX® was subject to and received pre-market approval by the FDA under 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. § 301.

FIFTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because the product at issue was made in accordance with the state of the art at the time it was manufactured.

SIXTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for the conduct which allegedly caused the injuries asserted in the Complaint, such an award would, if granted, violate Merck's state and federal constitutional rights.

SEVENTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages for an alleged act or omission of Merck, no act or omission was malicious, willful, wanton, reckless or grossly negligent and, therefore, any award of punitive damages is barred.

EIGHTEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs seek punitive damages, such claim is barred because FOSAMAX® and its labeling was subject to and received pre-market approval by the FDA under 52 Stat. 1040, 21 U.S.C. § 301.

NINETEENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part under comment k to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

TWENTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because Merck provided legally adequate "directions or warnings" as to the use of FOSAMAX® and any other medicine or pharmaceutical preparation Plaintiff alleges to have taken within the meaning of comment j to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts.

TWENTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred under Section 4, *et seq.*, of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

TWENTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred under comment f to Section 6 of the Restatement (Third) of Torts: Products Liability.

TWENTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

There is no practical or technically feasible alternative design that would have reduced the alleged risk without substantially impairing the reasonably anticipated and intended function of FOSAMAX®.

TWENTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part by failure to mitigate damages.

TWENTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred in whole or in part because Merck's conduct conforms with medical knowledge.

TWENTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

With respect to each and every cause of action, Plaintiffs are not entitled to recovery for strict liability because Plaintiffs cannot state claims founded in strict liability because, among other things, comments j and k to Section 402A of the Restatement (Second) of Torts relegates Plaintiffs' claims to a negligence cause of action.

TWENTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

All activities of Merck as alleged in the Complaint were expressly authorized and/or regulated by a government agency. Therefore, Plaintiffs' claims pertaining to unfair or deceptive practices are barred.

TWENTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

With respect to each and every cause of action, Plaintiffs are not entitled to recover because if the product involved was unsafe, which Merck denies, then it was unavoidably unsafe as defined in Restatement of Torts. The apparent benefits of the product exceeded any apparent risk given the scientific knowledge available when the product was marketed.

TWENTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Merck's advertisements and labeling with respect to the products which are the subject matter of this action were not false or misleading and, therefore, constitute protected commercial speech under the applicable provisions of the United States, Alabama, and New York Constitutions.

THIRTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The public interest in the benefit and availability of the product which is the subject matter of this action precludes liability for risks, if any, resulting from any activities undertaken by Defendant, which were unavoidable given the state of human knowledge at the time those activities were undertaken. With respect to Plaintiffs' claims, if it is determined there is a risk inherent in the product which is the subject matter of this action, then such risk, if any, is outweighed by the benefit of the product.

THIRTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

At all times relevant herein, any product which is the subject matter of this action processed and distributed by Merck in any state in the United States was processed and distributed in a reasonable and prudent manner based upon available medical and scientific knowledge and further was processed and distributed in accordance with and pursuant to all applicable regulations of the FDA.

THIRTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

With respect to each and every purported cause of action, the acts of Merck were at all times done in good faith and without malice.

THIRTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent there were any risks associated with the use of the product which is the subject matter of this action which Merck knew or should have known and which gave rise to a duty to warn, Merck at all times discharged such duty through appropriate and adequate warnings in accordance with federal and state law.

THIRTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have not sustained an ascertainable loss of property or money.

THIRTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs have not suffered any actual injury or damages.

THIRTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims are barred under the doctrine of economic loss.

THIRTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This case is more appropriately brought in a different venue as defined in 28 U.S.C. §1404(a).

THIRTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This case is subject to dismissal and/or transfer to another venue pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1406(a).

THIRTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

This case is subject to dismissal or stay on the grounds of *forum non conveniens*.

FORTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims of fraud are not pleaded with the required particularity.

FORTY-FIRST AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs cannot recover for the claims asserted because Plaintiffs have failed to comply with the conditions precedent necessary to bring this action and/or each particular cause of action asserted by Plaintiffs.

FORTY-SECOND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Plaintiffs' claims for breach of warranty are barred because Plaintiffs did not rely on such warranties and the claims are otherwise barred for lack of timely notice, lack of privity and/or because the alleged warranties were disclaimed.

FORTY-THIRD AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

An asymptomatic plaintiff lacks standing because she has suffered no damages and no injury-in-fact.

FORTY-FOURTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

To the extent that Plaintiffs assert claims based on Merck's adherence to and compliance with applicable state laws, regulations and rules, such claims are preempted by federal law under the Final Rule, Requirements on Content and Format of Labeling

for Human Prescription Drug and Biologic Products, FDA Docket No. 2000N-1269 (January 24, 2006).

FORTY-FIFTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The substantive law of Alabama applies to Plaintiffs' claims.

FORTY-SIXTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Merck affirmatively pleads that any punitive damages that the Plaintiffs may recover in this case should be capped in keeping with Alabama Code Section 6-11-21, as amended in 1999 (Act. No. 99-358) and in the spirit of the Alabama Supreme Court's decision in *Oliver v. Towns*, 738 So. 2d 798 (Ala. 1999).

FORTY-SEVENTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The demand for punitive damages in the instant case is subject to the limitations established by the Alabama legislature and set forth in Ala. Code § 6-11-21 (1975). Merck adopts by reference the defenses, criteria, limitations, and standards mandated by this Alabama statute. The Alabama Supreme Court's action in abolishing the legislatively created cap on punitive damages was unconstitutional and is without effect. Under the Constitutions of the United States and the State of Alabama, the Alabama Supreme Court cannot abolish the cap created by the legislature on punitive damages through this judicial decision. See *Honda Motor Co., Ltd. v. Oberg*, 512 U.S. 415, 114 S. Ct. 2331, 2340 n.9 (1994).

FORTY-EIGHTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Merck avers that the punitive damage cap set out in Ala. Code § 6-11-21 (1975) applies to the instant case. See *Horton Homes, Inc. v. Brooks*, 832 So. 2d 44 (Ala. 2001).

FORTY-NINTH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

Merck avers that the method of imposing punitive damages violates Amendment 328, Section 6.11 of the Constitution of Alabama, which prohibits the use of a procedural rule to abridge, enlarge, or modify the substantive right of any party. See *Leonard v. Terminix Int'l Co.*, 854 So. 2d 529 (Ala. 2002).

FIFTIETH AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSE

The imposition of punitive damages is an act of policy making on the part of the judiciary, in violation of Article III, Section 43 of the Constitution of Alabama.

In so much as the Complaint does not describe the alleged underlying claims with sufficient particularity to enable Merck to determine all of its legal, contractual and equitable rights, Merck reserves the right to amend and/or supplement the averments of its Answer to assert any and all pertinent liability defenses ascertained through further investigation and discovery.

Merck will rely on all defenses that may become available during discovery or trial.

WHEREFORE, Merck respectfully demands judgment dismissing Plaintiffs' Complaint with prejudice and awarding Merck such other and further relief that the Court may deem just and proper.

JURY DEMAND

Merck demands a trial by jury as to all issues so triable.

DATED: New York, New York
June 3, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

HUGHES HUBBARD & REED LLP

By: _____
Norman C. Kleinberg
Theodore V. H. Mayer
William J. Beausoleil

One Battery Park Plaza
New York, New York 10004-1482
(212) 837-6000
kleinber@hugheshubbard.com
mayer@hugheshubbard.com
beausole@hugheshubbard.com

Attorneys for Defendant Merck & Co., Inc.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day of June, 2008, I caused a copy of the foregoing ANSWER AND AFFIRMATIVE DEFENSES OF MERCK & CO., INC. to be served via first-class mail, postage prepaid, on the following:

LANIER LAW FIRM, PLLC
Catherine T. Heacox
126 East 56th Steet-6th Floor
New York, NY 10022

The above addresses have appeared on the prior papers in this action as the office address of the attorneys for Plaintiff.

Deponent is over the age of 18 years and not a party to this action.

I further certify under penalty of perjury that under the laws of the United States of America the foregoing is true and correct.

Executed on June 3, 2008

/s/
Shawn McEnnis